

REMARKS

In view of the Request for Continuing Examination, consideration of the new issues provided in Applicants' October 13, 2003 Response is respectfully requested. The November 18, 2003 Advisory Action identified the new issues.

This Supplemental Amendment includes additional claims for examination.

An Information Disclosure Statement including the European Search Report and references cited thereon is also provided herewith. Consideration of the references and initialing of Form PTO-1449 is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 5, 10 and 13.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Roberto U.S. Patent No. 5 562 581 in view of Dietrich U.S. Patent No. 4 197 790 and further in view of Taddei, U.S. Patent No. 3 888 164. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Roberto, Dietrich and further in view of Gutinger, U.S. Patent No. 5 910 078.

Claims 1-4, 9, 11, 12 and 14 are allowable for the reasons discussed in Applicants' Amendment After Final Rejection dated October 13, 2003.

This Supplemental Amendment includes additional Claims 15-26, which further distinguish the applied prior art. Claims 15-17 recite that the output device comprises a conveyor and that the first and second devices provided at the expansion chamber comprise conveyors. The conveyors in Claims 15 and 17 further include lugs for moving the box sleeves. The applied prior art does not disclose this arrangement. Therefore, Claims 15-17 distinguish the applied prior art.

Claims 18 and 19 also recite that the output device and at least one of the rotating devices comprise conveyors. Therefore, Claims 18 and 19 also distinguish the applied prior art.

Claim 20 recites the method of Claim 11 including the use of first, second and third conveyors. As discussed above, the applied prior art does not disclose or suggest a method including such an arrangement.

Independent Claim 21 recites a device for erecting folding boxes that includes a combination of elements not believed present in the applied prior art. Dependent Claims 22-26 depend from Claim 21 and include additional features that distinguish the applied prior art. Therefore, Applicants request allowance of Claims 21-26.

For the above reasons, allowance of Claims 1-5 and 9-26 is respectfully requested.

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

*Brian R. Tumm*

Brian R. Tumm

BRT/ad

FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL  
& TANIS, P.C.  
2026 Rambling Road  
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1631  
Phone: (269) 381-1156  
Fax: (269) 381-5465

Dale H. Thiel	Reg. No. 24	323
David G. Boutell	Reg. No. 25	072
Ronald J. Tanis	Reg. No. 22	724
Terryence F. Chapman	Reg. No. 32	549
Mark L. Maki	Reg. No. 36	589
David S. Goldenberg	Reg. No. 31	257
Liane L. Churney	Reg. No. 40	694
Brian R. Tumm	Reg. No. 36	328
Steven R. Thiel	Reg. No. 53	685
Sidney B. Williams, Jr.	Reg. No. 24	949

Encl: None

112.05/03